



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,787	09/28/2001	Tomoaki Endoh	03500.015845	3430
5514	7590	08/05/2008		
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			EXAMINER	
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			DULANEY, BENJAMIN O	
NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		08/05/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/964,787	Applicant(s) ENDOH, TOMOAKI
	Examiner BENJAMIN O. DULANEY	Art Unit 2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 45-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 45-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No.(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed 12/28/07, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 45-54 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of U.S. patent 6,181,436 by Kurachi, U.S. patent 5,819,047 by Bauer et al. and U.S. patent 6,667,816 by Van Buren et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 1) Claims 45, 47, 48, 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,181,436 by Kurachi.
- 2) Regarding claims 45, 48 and 51, Kurachi teaches a method of controlling peripheral equipment connected to a network and managed by a directory server on the network, said method comprising: a first step of receiving, from an information processing apparatus on the network, a print job together with an access ticket issued from the directory server, at a first time (figure 9; Column 9, lines 19-24); a storing step of storing the print job received in said first receiving step in a storing medium (figure 9; Column 9, line 23); a first decrypting step of decrypting the access ticket received

together with the print job in said first receiving step (figures 9 and 11; column 15, lines 29-30); a first control step of determining validity of the access ticket received in said first receiving step based on a decrypting result of said first decrypting step and limiting execution of the print job received in said first receiving step (Column 13, line 63 - Column 14, line 10; if the key is not available for decryption execution, then the job cannot be read and therefore printing is limited); a second receiving step of receiving, from an information processing apparatus on the network, a management command together with an access ticket issued from the directory server, at a second time different from the first time of said first receiving step (Column 10, lines 34-37); a second control step of determining validity of the access ticket received in said second receiving step based on a decrypting result of said second decrypting step and limiting execution (Column 11, lines 5-12; Column 13, line 63 - Column 14, line 10; execution of a display command is limited to user who know the secret key for decryption); wherein in the case where the management command received in said second receiving step is one for deleting a specific print job stored in the storing medium, said second control step determines whether or not user information in the decryption result of said second decrypting step corresponds to the user information in the decryption result of said first decrypting step and limits execution of deleting the specific print job in the storing medium (Column 10, lines 33-37; if a second decryption is performed (as explained below) then the "user information" could simply be the secret key and execution is limited to those who have it).

Kurachi does not explicitly teach a second decrypting step of decrypting the access ticket received together with the management command in said second receiving step.

The aim of Kurachi is to provide secure transmissions between a client/server device and a printing device using a secret encryption key known to devices that are authorized to manage the print jobs of the system, as generally shown in figures 9 and 11. Since Kurachi details a method for encrypting some of the transmissions (column 13, lines 12-24; figure 9, items 201g, 203j, 203k and 201h), it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill for the system of Kurachi to use its own security method on all of the transmissions between client and printer. The motivation for doing so would be "to provide a print managing system and a print managing method which can keep print data secret" (Column 2, lines 7-9). Therefore it would be obvious for Kurachi to encrypt/decrypt management commands to obtain the invention as specified by claims 45, 48 and 51.

3) Regarding claims 47 and 50, Kurachi teaches a method wherein the management command received in said second receiving step is one for displaying a job list, said second control step changes a display for of the job list based on the decryption result of said second decrypting step (Column 11, lines 5-12; note: the claim does not specifically state what device is performing the displaying).

4) Claims 46 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,181,436 by Kurachi, and further in view of U.S. patent 5,819,047 by Bauer et al.

Regarding claims 46 and 49, Kurachi does not specifically teach a method according to claim 45, wherein the decrypting result of said first decrypting step includes information about a permitted number of prints.

Bauer teaches a method according to claim 45, wherein the decrypting result of said first decrypting step includes information about a permitted number of prints (Column 4, lines 40-58).

Kurachi and Bauer are combinable because both are from the printing field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kurachi with Bauer to add a print quota. The motivation for doing so would have been to "provide a simplified way of controlling usage of resources of a networked computing system" (Column 2, lines 56-57). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Kurachi with Bauer to obtain the invention as specified by claims 46 and 49.

5) Claims 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,181,436 by Kurachi, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,667,816 by Van Buren et al.

Regarding claims 52-54, Kurachi teaches a control method for a printer connected to a network and managed by a directory server on the network, said method comprising: a receiving step of receiving, from an information processing apparatus on the network, a print job together with an access ticket issued from the directory server (figure 9; Column 9, lines 19-24); a storing step of storing the print job received in said receiving step in a storing medium (figure 9; Column 9, line 23); a decrypting step of decrypting the access ticket received together with the print job in said receiving step (figures 9 and 11; column 15, lines 29-30); a first control step of determining validity of the access ticket received in said receiving step based on a decrypting result of said decrypting step and limiting execution of the print job received in said receiving step (Column 13, line 63 - Column 14, line 10; if the key is not available for decryption execution, then the job cannot be read and therefore printing is limited).

Kurachi does not specifically teach an obtaining step of obtaining, from the directory server, access information corresponding to a specific user; an inputting step of inputting a management command from an operation panel of the printer; a second control step of determining validity of the access information obtained in said obtaining step and limiting execution of the management command, wherein in the case where the management command inputted in said inputting step is one for deleting a specific print job stored in the storing medium, said second control step determines whether or not user information in the access information corresponds to user information in the decryption result of said decrypting step and limits execution of deleting the specific print job in the storing medium.

Van Buren teaches an obtaining step of obtaining, from the directory server, access information corresponding to a specific user; an inputting step of inputting a management command from an operation panel of the printer (Column 6, lines 10-14); a second control step of determining validity of the access information obtained in said obtaining step and limiting execution of the management command (Column 6, lines 40-44), wherein in the case where the management command inputted in said inputting step is one for deleting a specific print job stored in the storing medium, said second control step determines whether or not user information in the access information corresponds to user information in the decryption result of said decrypting step and limits execution of deleting the specific print job in the storing medium (Column 7, lines 1-8).

Kurachi and Van Buren are combinable because both are from the printing field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kurachi with Van Buren to add inputting a deletion command at the printing device interface. The motivation for doing so would have been so that "management commands" can be executed "only on command from the operator control unit (printer interface)" (Abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Kurachi with Van Buren to obtain the invention as specified by claims 52-54.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN O. DULANEY whose telephone number is (571)272-2874. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (10am - 6pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571)272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin O Dulaney/

Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625